



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,454	02/13/2004	Juergen Dickmann	3926.063	8976

41288

7590

03/19/2009

PATENT CENTRAL LLC

Stephan A. Pendorf

1401 Hollywood Boulevard

Hollywood, FL 33020

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2009

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief
(37 CFR 41.37)**

Application No.

10/779,454

Applicant(s)

DICKMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory J. Strimbu

Art Unit

3634

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 15 February 2009 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer.
EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☒ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner **and relied upon by appellant in the appeal**, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

The brief filed 12/15/08 fails to properly summarize the claimed subject matter. For example, the sensor-data evaluation unit and the control unit of claims 1 and 6 have not been mentioned in the summary of the claimed subject matter and a majority of the claimed elements in summary of the claimed subject matter do not have the corresponding specification citation, i.e., the page and line number of the specification which refers to the claimed element. It is suggested the applicant "map" the claimed subject matter. As another example, claim 4 has been separately argued but the specific limitations of claim 4 have not been set forth in the summary of the claimed subject matter. Additionally, the arguments for claims 7, 8, 9, 11-14 and 16-18 are sufficient. The applicant should argue why the limitations of each of the claims is separately patentable rather than relying on a claim's dependency on an independent claim for patentability. Merely arguing that a dependent claim is patentable because it depends from an independent claim is analogous to a statement that the dependent claims stand or fall with the independent claim.

/Gregory J. Strimbu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3634